Docket: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM; Submission: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE STATE OF MARYLAND WORCESTER COUNTY

ANJALI PHUKAN CHATELLE 3601 Captains Corridor Greenbackville, VA 23356

Plaintiff, C-23-CV-21-000083 Civil Action No._____

STATE OF MARYLAND

v.

Maryland Lottery and Gaming Control Agency Washington Park Business Center 1800 Washington Blvd., Suite 330 Baltimore, Maryland 21230

Defendant.

Serve on Maryland Office of the Attorney General 200 St. Paul Pl 19th Fl Baltimore, MD 21202

COMPLAINT

NOW COMES Plaintiff, Ms. Anjali Chatelle ("Chatelle"), pro se, and files this Complaint against the Maryland Lottery and Gaming Control Agency ("Defendant") and for reasons therefore states, that upon information and belief:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is an action concerning employment discrimination based on race, marital status, and/or gender.

THE PARTIES

- 2. Plaintiff, Anjali Phukan Chatelle (Anjali Reed Phukan at the time of the occurrence) is a U.S. citizen and individual residing in Greenbackville, Virginia and a citizen of the state of Virginia. Chatelle was a citizen of Maryland during the time of the occurrence, residing at her then home of 12907 Horn Island Rd, Ocean City, Maryland 21842. Chatelle is an Asian-American female.
- 3. Defendant, Maryland Lottery and Gaming Control Agency, is a department of the Maryland State government with more than fifteen employees. Defendant oversees gaming operations at casinos throughout Maryland and is headquartered at 1800 Washington Blvd., Suite 330, Baltimore, Maryland 2130. Defendant is an employer as defined by Maryland Code, as an "employer" includes the state. Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 20-601 (LexisNexis, Lexis Advance through legislation effective April 13, 2021, from the 2021 Regular Session of the General Assembly)

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 4. Chatelle worked for Defendant from on or about May 25, 2016 until November 4, 2019.
 From on or about July 1, 2016 until late October 2019, Chatelle was stationed at Ocean
 Downs Casino (ODC), located at 10218 Racetrack Road, Berlin, Maryland, in Worcester
 County. (See Exhibit A Position Description at Part 1, Item 10.)
- 5. The nature of the action is covered by Title VII ("Title VII") of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C.S. § 1981 and 42 U.S.C.S. § 2000, as well as Maryland Fair Employment Practices Act, Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 20-606.
- 6. The amount in dispute in this action, exclusive of interest and costs, exceeds the sum of \$25,000.

EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES

- 7. On or about December 12, 2019, Chatelle filed a complaint with the Maryland Commission on Civil Rights (MCCR) for color, marital status, race, retaliation, and sex, and the associated issue of constructive discharge. (See Exhibit B Complaint to MCCR First Page). MCCR general counsel and any assistant general counsel are special appointments in the State Personnel Management System. Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 20-206 (LexisNexis, Lexis Advance through legislation effective April 13, 2021, from the 2021 Regular Session of the General Assembly).
- 8. On or about December 13, 2019, Chatelle filed a complaint, similar to that sent to MCCR, with the Defendant. (See Exhibit C Tracking of Complaint to Defendant). Chatelle never received a response from Defendant from that complaint directly sent to Defendant.
- 9. On or about December 16, 2019, Chatelle filed a complaint with the Equal Opportunity and Employment Commission (EEOC) for race and gender, but when Chatelle went to the EEOC office to complete the complaint, the interviewing officer said it was a race-based claim.
 EEOC contacted Defendant regarding the complaint, and Defendant responded during the investigation period.
- 10. Chatelle received her right to sue letter from the EEOC on or about March 4, 2021 (per postmark on envelope), though the letter is dated February 25, 2021. (See Exhibit D EEOC Right to Sue Letter and Exhibit E Envelope from EEOC with Right to Sue Letter). 90 days from March 4, 2021 is June 2, 2021.

FACTS

11. Chatelle's original work location at ODC was about 4.9 miles from Chatelle's home, taking about 10 minutes to drive to and from work every day, and had no tolls.

- 12. In 2018, Chatelle was interested in doing activities with an ODC employee outside of work time and asked her supervisor if that was okay. Chatelle's supervisor at the time, who was an employee of Defendant, told Chatelle to ask the State Ethics Commission (SEC) for permission. Chatelle received permission to engage in out of work activities with the ODC employee.
- 13. Chatelle had satisfactory performance in her job up until the occurrence, which had included some telework days.
- 14. On or about September 12, 2019 Chatelle discussed via phone the situation with SEC who seemed to say it was okay to marry an ODC employee and still be stationed there, but to ask Defendant's ethics department for confirmation.
- 15. On or about September 13, 2019, Chatelle discussed via phone the situation with Organization Compliance Director for Defendant, James Butler. Over the next week, Butler told Chatelle he would look into the rules regarding this, but that as it was, engagement was not a reason for termination or changing work situations.
- 16. On or about September 23, 2019, Butler wanted Chatelle to obtain approval from the SEC in writing.
- 17. On or about October 6, 2019, Chatelle married an ODC employee.
- 18. Some time in October 2019, Chatelle was informed by other employees of Defendant of a similarly situated white male employee of Defendant, "Adam," who worked at the same work location married to a gaming employee also of the same work location. Chatelle was informed that Adam's manager and director for his department, both employees of Defendant, were aware of and approved of the marriage work relationship a while ago (years, months, and days unknown). Adam was a Compliance Officer.

- 19. On or about October 9, 2019, SEC gave Defendant guidance that Chatelle's marriage was an impermissible relationship and that an exception would likely not be allowed. (See Exhibit F SEC emailed Opinion at second "Forwarded message" timestamped "Wed, Oct 9, 2019 at 12:51 PM").
- 20. On or about October 9, 2019, based on Defendant allegations in their EEOC response,

 Chatelle informed SEC of Adam's similarly situated relationship, such that SEC was aware

 at least as of October 9, 2019 of another Defendant employee stationed at ODC married to an

 ODC employee of the same work location as their spouse. SEC hence was aware of a

 similarly impermissible relationship as of October 9, 2019. (See Exhibit G Defendant

 EEOC Follow-up First Four Pages at 4).
- 21. On or about October 14, 2019, 30 days after the request for SEC determination, Chatelle was informed by Butler and Portillo that SEC had decided that her marriage was an impermissible conflict of interest and that she needed to be reassigned to Hollywood Casino Perryville (HCP) because of her marriage immediately. HCP was located about 135 miles from Chatelle's home then, taking about 2 hours and 20 minutes to drive to, plus an additional cost for tolls each way.
- 22. On or about October 14, 2019, Chatelle was told by her manager Sonia Portillo, an employee of Defendant, that Chatelle would need to leave in the next few hours and report to headquarters the next day. From then on, she would be reporting to the HCP, using her own travel time, and her own money for the additional gas and tolls with no reimbursement. (See Exhibit H Resignation due to unreasonable change in work location Message timestamped "Tue, Oct 15, 2019 at 3:24 PM").

- 23. On or about October 14, 2019, Chatelle informed Defendant's Portillo and Butler by phone that she was aware of the other marriage. Butler said that Adam's situation would have to be dealt with too now that they knew Defendant employees were not allowed to be working in the same casino as a gaming spouse.
- 24. Nowhere in Defendant's job description for Chatelle, nor Chatelle's job offer letter from Defendant does it seem to say that an employee can not be married to someone that works in gaming at that same work location. In addition, neither document discusses impermissible relationships for this position. (See Exhibit A Position Description).
- 25. On or about October 15, 2019, Chatelle was overcome with stress from the long commute and took a sick day.
- 26. On or about October 15, 2019 evening, Chatelle was overcome with stress from the time planning of the regular long commute, and high expense for gas and tolls to travel to her new work, and the physical demand of driving that much every day, and felt she must resign else face intolerable, physically demanding, and expensive commutes. (See Exhibit H Resignation due to unreasonable change in work location at 2 email timestamped "Tue, Oct 15, 2019 at 5:27 PM").
- 27. On or about October 16, 2019, Chatelle was placed on administrative leave by Defendant, effective October 17, 2019, though her last official date of employment would be November 4, 2019.
- 28. On or about October 17, Defendant required Chatelle drive to Defendant headquarters and return all equipment and sign a Non-Participation agreement that they drafted before allowing her to leave on good terms. Note the Non-Participation agreement was stapled to the Receipt for State Property, such that it seemed to be required to be completed for the

- termination process (See Exhibit I Receipt for State Property and Non-Participation Agreement).
- 29. On or about December 11, 2019, while no longer working for Defendant, Chatelle learned that the white male employee of Defendant, married to an ODC employee, was still working at ODC while that employee of Defendant was still working at that same work location.

 Upon information and belief, Chatelle was in a substantially similar situation as another Defendant employee.
- 30. Chatelle filed a complaint with the Equal Opportunity and Employment Commission on December 16, 2019. Defendant responded to their notice from the EEOC of Chatelle's discrimination complaint. Defendant's response indicated that they asked SEC to review the similarly situated coworker on October 23, 2019. 124 days later, on February 10, 2020 -- the decision was made that Adam too constituted "an impermissible conflict of interest." Defendant's response letter, dated February 13, 2020, said they are "now working on a compliance plan" for him. (See Exhibit J –Defendant's Initial Response to EEOC Charge Including statement regarding Adam at 2).
- 31. The effect of Chatelle not having a salary from which she could draw her regular expenses led to her having to sell her house she could no longer regularly afford due to being unemployed from a full-time permanent position so abruptly. The lifestyle she had grown accustomed to was no longer possible due to the immediate decrease in wages and need to find and work more part time / seasonal positions. This was further exacerbated by the Covid-19 pandemic.
- 32. Prior to the constructive discharge, Chatelle worked part time elsewhere, and maintained that income, and after constructive discharge, Chatelle was able to increase part time work at

- other employers some, but even then, still only part time with no full-time benefits such as annual leave, education assistance, health benefits, life insurance, etc. that she had at her job working for Defendant.
- 33. Chatelle lost retirement benefits and the cumulative effect of retirement benefits. One part time employer of Chatelle provided some retirement benefit, but it was a seasonal job so not full-time retirement benefits. In addition, she could have had that part time job while still a state employee (Upon information and belief, people work in the tax industry during season while still with full time employers). Hence Chatelle still lost some retirement benefits as well.
- 34. Upon information and belief, Chatelle would have had the salary "step" increase(s) that other full-time employees of Defendant received, as well as other bonuses including a "Covid-19 vaccine" bonus.
- 35. The reason for Chatelle leaving job also has negatively influenced her getting meaningful future employment.

Count I - Discrimination on the Basis of Race and/or Gender

36. Employers may not discriminate against an employee with respect to their "compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of . . . [her] race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin. 42 U.S.C.S. § 2000e-2 (LexisNexis, Lexis Advance through Public Law 116-344, approved January 13, 2021, with a gap of Public Law 116-283). These reasons, as well as marital status are also protected in Maryland from the same actions. Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 20-606 (LexisNexis, Lexis Advance through legislation effective April 13, 2021, from the 2021 Regular Session of the General Assembly).

- 37. Chatelle adopts and incorporates by reference all of the allegations set forth in the previous paragraphs as if the same were fully set forth herein and states:
- 38. Chatelle is, and at all times relevant hereto, an Asian-American female, a member of a protected class for her race, color, and gender. Race, color and/or gender was a motivating factor in Defendant's conduct even favoritism or preferential treatment to a non-protected class can be construed as unlawful discrimination. (See EEOC v. Richmond of New York d/b/a Richmond Children's Center, No. 05-CV-8342 (SCR)(MDF) (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 11, 2006) (disciplining a protected member and not disciplining a non-protected class member is still discrimination). A causal connection exists between Defendant's actions in treatment of Chatelle and her race and/or gender. This is protected by law as it is disparate discrimination.
- 39. Defendants' actions in making Chatelle get a written SEC determination upfront was discriminatory and not the practice required by a non-protected class employee.
- 40. Defendant's actions in removing Chatelle from her work location with less than 24 hours notice of determination was discriminatory and unreasonable, especially in light of telework solutions in this day and age. Defendant did not relocate Chatelle to the casino of her preference, even though there was an audit position open there and Defendant had asked Chatelle which she would have preferred.
- 41. SEC gave a determination to Defendant in 30 days for Chatelle but based on assertions of Defendant in EEOC documents took 124 days over four times as long to decide compared to Adam, the non-protected class employee of Defendant.
- 42. The aforesaid discriminatory treatment by Defendants toward Chatelle caused tangible harm to Chatelle in that they affected the terms, conditions, and privileges of her employment

- unreasonably and severely because she would have to drive an intolerable amount every day to work on her own time and mileage costs and/or relocation costs.
- 43. Another similarly situated employee not of Chatelle's race and gender was not subject to the same conditions of employment as Chatelle.
- 44. Chatelle is further entitled to compensatory and punitive damages because Defendant's actions were intentional and done with deliberate indifference to Chatelle's federally protected rights. 42 U.S.C.S. § 1981 (LexisNexis, Lexis Advance through Public Law 116-344, approved January 13, 2021, with a gap of Public Law 116-283).

Count II - Constructive Discharge

- 45. Employers may not discharge an employee because of her "race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin." 42 U.S.C.S. § 2000e-2 (LexisNexis, Lexis Advance through Public Law 116-344, approved January 13, 2021, with a gap of Public Law 116-283). These reasons for discharge, as well as marital status, are also prohibited in Maryland. Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 20-606 (LexisNexis, Lexis Advance through legislation effective April 13, 2021, from the 2021 Regular Session of the General Assembly).
- 46. Chatelle adopts and incorporates by reference all of the allegations set forth in the previous paragraphs as if the same were fully set forth herein and states:
- 47. Defendant's actions against Asian-American female Chatelle, member of a protected class, were discriminatory and led Chatelle to constructively discharge from her employment, as the sudden work location change was intolerable for commute time, physical demand of long drives, and high commute gas/toll expense.
- 48. That demanding Chatelle report to another location suddenly, when work can be done largely remotely, as evidenced by Chatelle's prior telework history, and that so many telecommuted

- regularly during the Covid-19 emergency, was an unnecessary relocation and segregation from the community she lived in, where the other similarly situated non-protected class employee was not subject to the same immediate removal or segregation.
- 49. That demanding Chatelle abruptly report to a new work location very far away at her own time and expense unreasonably and severely impacted her finances, health well-being, and work-life balance, such that it led to constructive discharge.
- 50. Defendant's actions leading to her constructive discharge caused Chatelle monetary damages, in that she failed to receive compensation for her mortgage, health, and other life needs to which she had grown accustomed.
- 51. Chatelle lost retirement benefits, as well as earnings on retirement benefits.
- 52. Chatelle lost her employer subsidized good health insurance. In addition, suffered from lack of medical care she was accustomed to from the health plan she was on which had better benefits than that she has to pay an additional amount for under her husband's plan.
- 53. In addition to the above, Chatelle also suffered anguish, anxiety, fear, helplessness, shock, humiliation, insult, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, and other damages as a result of the immediate relocation demand by Defendant.
- 54. Chatelle is further entitled to compensatory and punitive damages because Defendant's actions were intentional and deliberate indifference to Chatelle's federally protected rights.

 42 U.S.C.S. § 1981 (LexisNexis, Lexis Advance through Public Law 116-344, approved January 13, 2021, with a gap of Public Law 116-283).

Count III - Retaliation

55. An employer may not retaliate against its employees because the individual has opposed a prohibited employer action i.e., discrimination and discriminatory constructive discharge.

Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 20-606 (f) (LexisNexis, Lexis Advance through legislation effective April 13, 2021, from the 2021 Regular Session of the General Assembly). It is unlawful to discriminate or retaliate against Chatelle because she opposed employment practices made unlawful by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. 42 U.S.C.S. § 2000e-3 (LexisNexis, Lexis Advance through Public Law 116-344, approved January 13, 2021, with a gap of Public Law 116-283).

- 56. Chatelle adopts and incorporates by reference all of the allegations set forth in the previous paragraphs as if the same were fully set forth herein and states:
- 57. All such actions were adverse actions directed at Chatelle, and her race and gender were motivating factors, as well as her actions in filing a complaint with the EEOC and otherwise opposing Defendant's violations of Federal and State Civil Rights laws, including Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, in violation of 42 U.S.C. 2000e.
- 58. There was no fair bargaining in her being required to sign the non-participation agreement.
- 59. Defendant never provided Chatelle with a mileage log to fill out her final trip information to headquarters to deliver equipment, complete all final paperwork, and sign the non-participation agreement they required her to complete. It was standard practice for Chatelle to be reimbursed by Defendant for trips to headquarters at Defendant's request. Chatelle in the past was emailed the form to her business email address, but no longer had access to that as she was removed from the system abruptly upon placement on administrative leave. A physical form was not produced for Chatelle at the time of final paperwork nor mailed to her. The trip one way was about 143 miles.
- 60. Chatelle is further entitled to compensatory and punitive damages because Defendant's actions were intentional and done with deliberate indifference to Chatelle's federally

protected rights. 42 U.S.C.S. § 1981 (LexisNexis, Lexis Advance through Public Law 116-344, approved January 13, 2021, with a gap of Public Law 116-283).

IN SUMMARY

- 61. Chatelle realleges and incorporates by reference its allegations in all above Paragraphs.
- 62. Chatelle and Defendant entered into an employment contract by which Chatelle performed all employment duties in satisfactory performance.
- 63. Defendant has discriminated against Chatelle, member of a protected class compared to another employee of Defendant in a non-protected class, in requiring Chatelle to obtain a written SEC notice.
- 64. Defendant also discriminated against Chatelle in how to affect the SEC notice, resulting in constructive discharge.
- 65. Chatelle demanded that Defendant fulfill its obligations by way of a complaint mailed directly to them, one made with MCCR, and one with EEOC, but Defendant refused.
- 66. As a result of Defendant's discrimination, constructive discharge, and retaliation, Chatelle has been damaged in an amount to be determined by this honorable Court, but no less than \$25,001.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Chatelle respectfully requests that this honorable Court enter a judgment against Defendants, granting Chatelle the following relief:

- A. The entry of a judgement in favor of Chatelle and against Defendant.
- B. An order that Defendant pays Chatelle back pay and interest on back pay in the amount of \$150,000.00 for lost salary, step increases, sick/annual/personal leave, bonuses, retirement, education benefit, health and life insurance, and any other benefits not listed.

C. An order that Defendant pays Chatelle compensatory damages for future pecuniary losses (including reduced cumulative retirement funds and decline in health) and punitive damages in the amount of \$450,000.00.

D. An order that Defendant pays Chatelle back pay and interest on back pay in the amount of \$83 for mileage to \$4 for tolls to Defendant headquarters, to turn in equipment and sign other paperwork as requested by them that they still have not reimbursed.

E. Judgment against Defendant for Chatelle's fees and costs of the suit.

F. All other such relief as this honorable Court deems just and proper.

Dated: May 25, 2021
Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Anjali Phukan Chatelle
Anjali Phukan Chatelle
3601 Captains Corridor
Greenbackville, VA 23356
anjalireed@gmail.com
240-603-5541
Pro Se

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issues that are so triable.

Dated: May 25, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Anjali Phukan Chatelle

Anjali Phukan Chatelle

3601 Captains Corridor

Greenbackville, VA 23356

anjalireed@gmail.com

240-603-5541

Pro Se

Writ of Summons Request

This is an initial filing and I respectfully request that the Clerk's office issue a Writ of Summons for service.


Dated: May 25, 2021
Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Anjali Phukan Chatelle
Anjali Phukan Chatelle
3601 Captains Corridor
Greenbackville, VA 23356
anjalireed@gmail.com
240-603-5541
Pro Se

Case 1:21-cv-01734-GLR Document 1-2 Filed 07/12/21 Page 17 of 53

C-23-CV-21-000083

Page 17 of 53 E-FILED; Worcester Circuit Court Docket: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM; Submission: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM

EXHIBIT E - ENVELOPE FROM EEOC FOR RIGHT TO SUE LETTER



Case 1:21-cv-01734-GLR Document 1-2

Page 19 of 53 E-FILED; Worcester Circuit Court Docket: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM; Submission: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM

© COURT OF APPEALS ☐ COURT OF SP			Worcester County	, \
CIRCUIT COURT DISTRICT COURT	I OF WIA	KILAND FOR	City/0	County
DICINE Located at 1 W Market St, Snow Hill, MD 21863	Court Ado	Iress	e No. C-23-CV-21	-00083
STATE OF MARYLAND		Cas	e No. 0-20 0 21	
OR				1.1
Anjali Phukan Chatelle Plaintiff/Petitioner	vs.	Maryland Lottery	y and Gaming Contr Defendant/Responde	ol Agency
Paintii/Petitionet			Dotolium, xtoopone	•••
NOTICE REGARDING RESTRICTED IN Please DO NOT use this form to file into the following Risk Protective Order (ERPO), Guardianship, Juveni subject to inspection. Therefore, no confidentiality for Title of confidential submission: EXHIBIT G - DEFENDANT I	g case typ ile. By eit rm is nece	es: Adoption, E her rule or stati essary.	mergency Evalu ute these case typ	ation, Extreme
I 1 RESTRICTED DOCUMENT - The entire documen	t is not su	bject to inspection	n.	
☐ Child Abuse/Neglect: record created by an agency concern	ning child a	buse or neglect requ	uired by statute to be	kept confidential. Rule
16-914(d): Family Law Article, \$ 5-707: Human Services, \$	§ 1-202 and	d § 1-203		
☐ Financial Information: information about the finances balances, financial history or activities, or creditworthing	ess. <i>Gener</i>	al Provisions Artic	:le, § 4-336	
☐ Financial Statement: filed pursuant to Rule 9-202, a Ch Joint Statement of Marital and Non-marital Property file	iild Suppor d pursuan	t Guidelines Work to Rule 9-207. <i>Ri</i>	ksheet filed pursuar <i>de 16-914(l)</i>	at to Rule 9-206, or a
☐ Hearing Closed to the Public: recording/transcript of he	earing clos	sed to the public. I	Rule 16-914(g)	
☐ Marital Property: Joint Statement of Marital and Non-N	Marital Pro	perty. Rule 16-91	4(l)	
☐ Marriage License Application: until the effective date	of the licer	ise. <i>Rule 16-912(c</i>)	
☐ Medical Report: or other correspondence from a doctor	r or health	care professional.	Rule 16-914(i)	
☐ Parenting Plan/Joint Statement: prepared and filed und	der Rules!	9-204.1 and 9 - 204	.2. Rule 16-914(o)	
☐ Peace Order Denied/Dismissed/Consented - Shielded: ca	ase records	shielded under Cou	arts Article § 3-1510	(b). Rule 16-914(c)
☐ Pregnancy - Marriage License Application: certification	n of pregn	ancy of a person un	nder 18 from doctor	or nurse practitioner
in an application for a marriage license. Rule 16-912(c)				
☐ Presentence Investigation Report: (confidential until e	entered into	evidence) Rule 1	6-914(f)(6)	
☐ Protective Order Case: petition is sealed until the earlie	er of servic	e or denial of the	petition. Rule 16-91	!4(b)
Protective Order Denied/Dismissed/Consented - Shielded: o	case records	s shielded under FL	Article § 4-512(b)(2)), Rule 16-914(c)
☐ Refusal to Testify: case record maintained under Code,	Courts Ar	ticle, § 9-106 of th	ne refusal of an indi	vidual to testify in a
criminal action against the individual's spouse. Rule 16-	-914(f)(5)			
☐ Sealed or Shielded: (entire document) by court order. R	Rule 16-93	4 & 16-914(k)(1)	D 1 14 034 0	16 014(1)(2)
☐ Sealing or Shielding Motion: while pending, but not to		ve (5) business day	ys. Rule 16-934 & 1	(0-914(K)(Z)
☐ Tax Returns: state and federal tax returns. Rule 16-914	<i>(i)</i>			
Other:	R	ule or Statute:		
☑ DOCUMENT FROM A CONFIDENTIAL CASE TY	YPE FILE	D INTO A NON-	CONFIDENTIAL	CASE TYPE.
Confidential Case type: ☐ Child adoption ☐ Emerg	gency Eva	luation 🗀 ERPO	U Guargiansnip	OI & CHIIO
☐ Juvenile Court case record ☑ Other: (explain) E	quai Empi	syment Opportunit	lie inercetion but	contains
☐ 2. CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION - The docum			ne mspection but	Contains
confidential information that is not open to public in	ispection.			
That information consists of(Give a description of				
The information is made confidential by Rule(s)	of the informa	tion and not the actual re	estricted information.) der dated	
Pursuant to Rules 20-201.1 and 1-322.1, accompanying the docum	nent is a rec	or by court or	loes not contain the o	confidential information
	non is a roc	/s/ Anjali Phukan	Chatelle	N/A - Pro Se
May 25, 2021 Date		Signature		CPF ID No.
N/A Fax		Anjali Phukan Ch	Printed Name	
204-603-5541		3601 Captains Co		
Telephone Number anjalireed@gmail.com		Greenbackville, V	/A 23356	NAME OF THE OWNER OWNER OF THE OWNER
E-mail			City, State, Zip	
MDJ-008 (Rev. 01/2021)				

Page 20 of 53 E-FILED; Worcester Circuit Court

Docket: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM: Submission: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM

& R ^{RYL} 4 № □ COURT OF APPEALS □ COURT OF S			ıty 🔽
Located at 1 W Market St, Snow Hill, MD 21863		Cir	y/County
STATE OF MARYLAND	Court A	ddress C-23-CV-2	21-000083
OR		04501101	
Anjali Phukan Chatelle	vs.	Maryland Lottery and Gaming Con	trol Agency
Plaintiff/Petitioner		Defendant/Respon	dent
NOTICE REGARDING RESTRICTED II Please DO NOT use this form to file into the following Risk Protective Order (ERPO), Guardianship, Juve subject to inspection. Therefore, no confidentiality for the first of confidential submission: EXHIBIT J - DEFENDANT	ng case ty nile. By e	pes: Adoption, Emergency Eval	uation, Extreme voes are not
☐ Child Abuse/Neglect: record created by an agency conce	rning child	abuse or neglect required by statute to	be kept confidential. Rule
16-914(d); Family Law Article, § 5-707; Human Services	, § 1-202 0	and § $1-203$	hilitian not worth bonk
☐ Financial Information: information about the finance balances, financial history or activities, or creditworthi	s of an inc	nvidual, including assets, income, nate	omnes, net worm, bank
☐ Financial Statement: filed pursuant to Rule 9-202, a C Joint Statement of Marital and Non-marital Property fi	Child Supp led pursua	ort Guidelines Worksheet filed pursunt to Rule 9-207. <i>Rule 16-914(l)</i>	ant to Rule 9-206, or a
☐ Hearing Closed to the Public: recording/transcript of			
☐ Marital Property: Joint Statement of Marital and Non			
☐ Marriage License Application: until the effective date			
☐ Medical Report: or other correspondence from a doct			
☐ Parenting Plan/Joint Statement: prepared and filed u	ınder Rule	s 9-204.1 and 9-204.2. Rule 16-914(o) 1002 P. J. 16 01463
\square Peace Order Denied/Dismissed/Consented - Shielded:			
☐ Pregnancy - Marriage License Application: certification an application for a marriage license. Rule 16-912(c)			or or nurse practitioner
☐ Presentence Investigation Report: (confidential until	entered in	to evidence) Rule 16-914(f)(6)	014/1)
☐ Protective Order Case: petition is sealed until the ear	lier of serv	vice or denial of the petition. Rule 10-	914(D) (2) B.J. 16 014(a)
☐ Protective Order Denied/Dismissed/Consented - Shielded ☐ Refusal to Testify: case record maintained under Code criminal action against the individual's spouse. Rule 16	e, Courts <i>F</i> 6-914(f)(5,	Article, § 9-106 of the refusal of an in	dividual to testify in a
☐ Sealed or Shielded: (entire document) by court order.			16 014(1-)(2)
☐ Sealing or Shielding Motion: while pending, but not		nve (5) business days. Rule 10-934 &	; 10-914(K)(2)
☐ Tax Returns: state and federal tax returns. Rule 16-91		Rule or Statute: MD Code Ann, Gen 1	Prov. 5301/b)(2)
 ☑ Other: State Ethics Commission ☑ DOCUMENT FROM A CONFIDENTIAL CASE T 			
Confidential Case type: ☐ Child adoption ☐ Eme ☐ Juvenile Court case record ☒ Other: (explain)	r <mark>gency Ev</mark> Equal Emp	valuation ERPO Guardianshi ployment Opportunity Commission (EE	p of a child EOC) case
□ 2. CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION - The document	ment itsel	<u>f is subject to public inspection bu</u>	<u>it contains</u>
confidential information that is not open to public	<u>inspectio</u>	<u>1.</u>	
		nation and not the actual restricted information.)	
The information is made confidential by Rule(s)		or by court order dated	C1
Pursuant to Rules 20-201.1 and 1-322.1, accompanying the docu	ıment is a r	edacted version that does not contain the	N/A - Pro Se
May 25, 2021 Date	-	/s/ Anjali Phukan Chatelle Signature	CPF ID No.
N/A Pax		Anjali Phukan Chatelle Printed Name	
204-603-5541		3601 Captains Corridor Address	A LANGE TO THE STATE OF THE STA
Telephone Number anjalireed@gmail.com		Greenbackville, VA 23356	
F-mail		City, State, Zip	,

MDJ-008 (Rev. 01/2021)

-2 Filed 07/12/21 Page 21 of 53 E-FILED; Worcester Circuit Court Docket: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM; Submission: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM

C-23-CV-21-000083

EXHIBIT D - EEOC RIGHT TO SUE LETTER

6500 form (6)	product U.S	S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPOI	RTUNITY COMMISSIO	ON CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTO
		DISMISSAL AND NOTIC	E OF RIGHTS	
P.O. 1	l Chatelle Box 1330 n, MD 21811		From Baltimore Fi G.H. Fallon 31 Hopkins Baltimore, M	Federal Building Plaza, Suite 1432
Ш		on(s) asymeyed viliosa identity is (29 CFR §1601 7(a))		
EEOC Charg	e No.	EEOC Representative	***	Telephone No.
		Victor Owolabl,		(440) 200 2249
531-2020-		Investigator		(410) 209-2218
THE EEO		ON THIS CHARGE FOR THE F		
	The facts alteged in the ci	narge fail to state a claim under any	of the statutes enforce	d by the EEOC.
	Your allegations did not in	welve a disability as defined by the	Americans With Disabit	ities Act.
	The Respondent employs	less than the required number of er	nployees or is not othe	rwise covered by the statutes
	Your charge was not till discrimination to file your		ords, you waited too	long after the date(s) of the alleged
X	determination about whether	har further investigation would asta	plish violations of the to respondent is in con-	r with its investigation, and makes no statute. This does not mean the claims option with the statutes. The EEOC ing been raised by this charge.
				gency that investigated this charge.
	Other (briefly state)			
		• NOTICE OF SUIT		
Discrimina You may fill lawsuit mu	ition in Employment Ad e a lawsuit against the re st be filed WITHIN 90 D	espondentis) under federal law t	dismissal and of you based on this charge tice; or your right to	ir right to sue that we will send you -
alleged EP.	Act (EPA): EPA suits m A underpayment. This m If file suit may not be co	ust be filed in federal or state coreans that backpay due for any liectible.	irt within 2 years (3 y violations that occu	ears for willful violations) of the errod more than 2 years (3 years)
			e Commission	
•		Rowning Ste		02/25/21
Enclosurea(s)	Rosemarie Rh Director	odes,	(Date Issued)

L-2 Filed 07/12/21 Page 23 of 53 E-FILED; Worcester Circuit Court Docket: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM; Submission: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM

CIRCUIT COURT DISTRICT COURT	OF MAR	YLAND FOR	Worcester Count	ty 💌	
Located at 1 W Market St, Snow Hill, MD 21863			C-23-CV-2	•	
STATE OF MARYLAND OR	Court Addre	ss Ca	ise No		
Anjali Phukan Chatelle	vs.	Maryland Lotte	ry and Gaming Con	trol Agency	
Plaintiff/Petitioner	10.		Defendant/Respond	dent	
NOTICE REGARDING RESTRICTED INF	ORMATI	ON PURSU	JANT TO RULE	20-201.1	
Please DO NOT use this form to file into the following	case types	: Adoption,	Emergency Eval	uation, Extreme	
Risk Protective Order (ERPO), Guardianship, Juvenil subject to inspection. Therefore, no confidentiality for	ie. Dy eitilt m ie nocoes	er fuie of Sta Forv	tute these case ty	pes are not	
Title of confidential submission: EXHIBIT B - COMPLAINT To	O MCCR -	FIRST PAGE			
■ 1. RESTRICTED DOCUMENT - The entire document			on.		
Child Abuse/Neglect: record created by an agency concerni	ng child abu	se or neglect re 1-203	quired by statute to b		
☐ Financial Information: information about the finances of	of an individ	ual, including	assets, income, liab	oilities, net worth, ban	K
balances, financial history or activities, or creditworthine. Financial Statement: filed pursuant to Rule 9-202, a Chi	SS, Generai Id Sunnort (Provisions Ari Suidelines Wo	<i>icie, y 4-330</i> rkeheat filad mirsus	ent to Rule 9-206, or a	
Joint Statement of Marital and Non-marital Property filed	l pursuant to	Rule 9-207. <i>I</i>	Rule 16-914(l)	int to Rule 3-200, or a	
☐ Hearing Closed to the Public: recording/transcript of he					
☐ Marital Property: Joint Statement of Marital and Non-M					
☐ Marriage License Application: until the effective date o					
☐ Medical Report: or other correspondence from a doctor					
☐ Parenting Plan/Joint Statement: prepared and filed und	ler Rules 9-2	204.1 and 9-20	4.2. Rule 16-914(o,)	
☐ Peace Order Denied/Dismissed/Consented - Shielded: case	se records sh	ielded under Co	ourts Article § 3-151	0(b), Rule 16-914(c)	
☐ Pregnancy - Marriage License Application: certification	of pregnand	ey of a person i	under 18 from docto	or or nurse practitioner	
in an application for a marriage license. Rule 16-912(c)	atered into e	vidence) Rula	16-914(1)(6)		
☐ Presentence Investigation Report: (confidential until er	mereu mio e	or donial of the	10-21-(j)(0) notition Pula 16-0	0147b)	
☐ Protective Order Case: petition is sealed until the earlier	r or service (or demai or the	Autiala 8 / 512/b)	0) Pulo 16 014(a)	
☐ Protective Order Denied/Dismissed/Consented - Shielded: ca	ase records sr	neided under Fi	. Afficie § 4-3 (2(0)(.	2), Ruie 10-914(c) Tividual to testify in a	
☐ Refusal to Testify: case record maintained under Code, 6 criminal action against the individual's spouse. Rule 16-9	Courts Aruc (147975)	ie, g 9-100 oi	me rerusar or an inc	aividual to testify in a	
☐ Sealed or Shielded: (entire document) by court order. Ri		2 16.011/k)/1)			
☐ Sealing or Shielding Motion: while pending, but not to	avaged five	(5) business di	ave Rule 16-034 &	16-014(k)(2)	
		(3) ousiness u	1ys. Ruic 10-254 &	10)1 /(19(2)	
☐ Tax Returns: state and federal tax returns. Rule 16-914()					
Other:		e or Statute:		1 CASE TVDE	
■ DOCUMENT FROM A CONFIDENTIAL CASE TY Confidential Case type: □ Child adoption □ Emerging	PE FILED ency Evalus	INTO A NON	r-CONFIDENTIA D∏ Guardianshi	n of a child	
☐ Juvenile Court case record ☑ Other: (explain) M.	D Commissi	on on Civil Rig	hts (MCCR) case		
□ 2. CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION - The docume				it contains	_
confidential information that is not open to public ins			•		
That information consists of					
(Give a description of			restricted information.)		
The information is made confidential by Rule(s)		or by court o	rder dated	and douted informatic	~·
Pursuant to Rules 20-201.1 and 1-322.1, accompanying the docume	ent is a redac	ted version that / Anjali Phukai	Chatalla	N/A - Pro Se	41.
May 25, 2021 Date	Si	gnature		CPF ID No.	
N/A	A	njali Phukan C	hatelle Printed Name		
204-603-5541 Fax	_3	601 Captains C	orridor		
Telephone Number		reenbackville,	Address VA 23356		
anjalireed@gmail.com E-mail		. voitouoix viito,	City, State, Zip	- WINEMAN	
MDJ-008 (Rev. 01/2021)					

-2 Filed 07/12/21 E-FNED; Worcester Circuit Court Docket: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM; Submission: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM

© CIRCUIT COURT □ DISTRICT COURT	I OF M.	AKYLAND F	C Wolcester Cou	inty 💌
VOICING Located at 1 W Market St, Snow Hill, MD 21863	Court A	ddress		
STATE OF MARYLAND	Court		Case No. C-23-CV-	21-000003
OR				
Anjali Phukan Chatelle	vs.	Maryland Lo	ottery and Gaming Co Defendant/Respo	ontrol Agency
Plaintiff/Petitioner			Deteridani	one on
NOTICE REGARDING RESTRICTED IN Please DO NOT use this form to file into the following Risk Protective Order (ERPO), Guardianship, Juven subject to inspection. Therefore, no confidentiality for title of confidential submission: EXHIBIT I - RECEIPT FOR STATES.	g case ty	pes: Adoption	n, Emergency Eva	aluation, Extreme types are not
■ 1. RESTRICTED DOCUMENT - The entire document	it is not s	subject to inspe	ection.	
Child Abuse/Neglect: record created by an agency concern	ning child	abuse or neglec	t required by statute to	be kept confidential. Rul
16-914(d): Family Law Article, § 5-707; Human Services,	§ 1-202 a	ınd § 1-203		
☐ Financial Information: information about the finances balances, financial history or activities, or creditworthing	ess. Gene	eral Provisions .	Article, § 4-336	
☐ Financial Statement: filed pursuant to Rule 9-202, a Clubration of Marital and Non-marital Property file	ed pursua	nt to Rule 9-20	7. Rule 16-914(l)	uant to Rule 9-206, or a
☐ Hearing Closed to the Public: recording/transcript of h				
☐ Marital Property: Joint Statement of Marital and Non-				
\square Marriage License Application: until the effective date				
☐ Medical Report: or other correspondence from a doctor				
☐ Parenting Plan/Joint Statement: prepared and filed un	der Rule	s 9-204.1 and 9-	-204.2. Rule 16-914((0)
☐ Peace Order Denied/Dismissed/Consented - Shielded: c	ase record	ds shielded under	r Courts Article § 3-1	510(b). Rule 16-914(c)
☐ Pregnancy - Marriage License Application: certification in an application for a marriage license. <i>Rule 16-912(c)</i>				etor or nurse practitioner
☐ Presentence Investigation Report: (confidential until e	entered ir	nto evidence) <i>Rt</i>	ule 16-914(f)(6)	
☐ Protective Order Case: petition is sealed until the earlie	er of serv	ice or denial of	the petition. Rule 16	5-914(b)
☐ Protective Order Denied/Dismissed/Consented - Shielded: ☐ Refusal to Testify: case record maintained under Code, criminal action against the individual's spouse. Rule 16-	Courts A	Article, § 9-106	r FL Article § 4-512(b of the refusal of an i)(2). Rule 16-914(c) ndividual to testify in a
☐ Sealed or Shielded: (entire document) by court order. I	Rule 16-9	34 & 16-914(k)	(1)	
☐ Sealing or Shielding Motion: while pending, but not to	exceed	five (5) busines	s days. <i>Rule 16-934</i>	& 16-914(k)(2)
☐ Tax Returns: state and federal tax returns. Rule 16-914	(j)			
▼ Other: State Ethics Commission			: MD Code Ann, Ger	
 □ DOCUMENT FROM A CONFIDENTIAL CASE TY Confidential Case type: □ Child adoption □ Emerging □ Juvenile Court case record □ Other: (explain) 	YPE FIL gency Ev	ED INTO A N valuation EI	ON-CONFIDENTI RPO □ Guardiansl	AL CASE TYPE. hip of a child
☐ 2. CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION - The docum	ent itsel	f is subject to	public inspection l	out contains
confidential information that is not open to public in				,
That information consists of				
(Give a description of			tual restricted information. rt order dated)
The information is made confidential by Rule(s)	nont is a r	Of by cou		he confidential information
	nem is a i	s/ Anjali Pht/	ikan Chatelle	N/A - Pro Se
May 25, 2021 Date		Signature		CPF ID No.
N/A Fax		Anjali Phuka	Printed Nan	ne
204-603-5541 Telephone Number		3601 Captain	s Corridor Address	
relephone runnoer				
anjalireed@gmail.com		Greenbackvil	lle, VA 23356 City, State, Z	

-2 Filed 07/12/21 Page 25 of 53 E-FILED; Worcester Circuit Court Docket: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM; Submission: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM

NARYLANS □ COURT OF APPEALS □ COURT OF S			
CIRCUIT COURT DISTRICT COUR	RT OF MA	ARYLAND FOR Worcester Con	unty
Colors Located at 1 W Market St, Snow Hill, MD 21863	Court A		7-21-000083
STATE OF MARYLAND OR	Court A	Case No.	-21-00000
Anjali Phukan Chatelle	VS.	Maryland Lottery and Gaming C	ontrol Agency
Plaintiff/Petitioner		Defendant/Resp	ondent
NOTICE REGARDING RESTRICTED IN Please DO NOT use this form to file into the following Risk Protective Order (ERPO), Guardianship, Juver subject to inspection. Therefore, no confidentiality for Title of confidential submission: EXHIBIT H - RESIGNATION 1. RESTRICTED DOCUMENT - The entire docume	ng case ty nile. By e orm is ne ON DUE TO	pes: Adoption, Emergency Evither rule or statute these case cessary. O UNREASONABLE CHANGE IN	aluation, Extreme types are not
Child Abuse/Neglect: record created by an agency concer	rning child	abuse or neglect required by statute t	o be kept confidential. Rule
16-914(d) · Family Law Article, § 5-707: Human Services,	, § 1-202 a.	nd § 1-203	
☐ Financial Information: information about the finances	s of an ind	ividual, including assets, income, l	iabilities, net worth, bank
balances, financial history or activities, or creditworthin	ness. Gene	ral Provisions Article, § 4-336	
☐ Financial Statement: filed pursuant to Rule 9-202, a C Joint Statement of Marital and Non-marital Property fil	led pursuar	nt to Rule 9-207. Rule 16-914(l)	suant to Rule 9-206, or a
☐ Hearing Closed to the Public: recording/transcript of			
☐ Marital Property: Joint Statement of Marital and Non-			
☐ Marriage License Application: until the effective date	e of the lice	ense. Rule 16-912(c)	
☐ Medical Report: or other correspondence from a doctor	or or health	care professional. Rule 16-914(i)	
☐ Parenting Plan/Joint Statement: prepared and filed u	nder Rules	9-204.1 and 9-204.2. Rule 16-914	(0)
☐ Peace Order Denied/Dismissed/Consented - Shielded:	case record	s shielded under Courts Article § 3-1	510(b). Rule 16-914(c)
☐ Pregnancy - Marriage License Application: certification in an application for a marriage license. Rule 16-912(c)			ctor or nurse practitioner
☐ Presentence Investigation Report: (confidential until	entered in	to evidence) <i>Rule 16-914(f)(6)</i>	
☐ Protective Order Case: petition is sealed until the earl	lier of serv	ice or denial of the petition. Rule 16	6-914(b)
☐ Protective Order Denied/Dismissed/Consented - Shielded: ☐ Refusal to Testify: case record maintained under Code criminal action against the individual's spouse. Rule 16	e, Courts A 5-914(f)(5)	rticle, § 9-106 of the refusal of an	o)(2). Rule 16-914(c) individual to testify in a
Sealed or Shielded: (entire document) by court order.			& 16 01A(b)(2)
☐ Sealing or Shielding Motion: while pending, but not t		ive (5) business days. Rule 10-934	Q 10-914(N)(2)
☐ Tax Returns: state and federal tax returns. Rule 16-914			
☐ Other: ☑ DOCUMENT FROM A CONFIDENTIAL CASE T	ו דוים יותועי	Rule or Statute:	IAL CASE TVPE
© DOCUMENT FROM A CONFIDENTIAL CASE I Confidential Case type: ☐ Child adoption ☐ Emer ☐ Juyenile Court case record ☑ Other: (explain)	rgency Ev	aluation 🗌 ERPO 🗌 Guardians	hip of a child
□ 2. CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION - The docum	ment itself	is subject to public inspection	but contains
confidential information that is not open to public i			
		-	
That information consists of(Give a description The information is made confidential by Rule(s)	of the inform	ation and not the actual restricted information or by court order dated	
Pursuant to Rules 20-201.1 and 1-322.1, accompanying the docu	ment is a re	edacted version that does not contain t	he confidential information.
May 25, 2021		/s/ Anjali Phukan Chatelle	N/A - Pro Se CPF ID No.
Date N/A		Signature Anjali Phukan Chatelle	
204-603-5541 Fax		Printed Nar 3601 Captains Corridor	me
Telephone Number		Address	
anjalireed@gmail.com		Greenbackville, VA 23356 City, State, 2	Zip

MDJ-008 (Rev. 01/2021)

-2 Filed 07/12/21 Page 26 of 53 E-FILED; Worcester Circuit Court Docket: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM; Submission: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM C-23-CV-21-000083

EXHIBIT H - RESIGNATION DUE TO UNREASONABLE CHANGE IN WORK LOCATION



Sonia Portillo -MLGCA- <sonia.portillo@maryland.gov>

Tomorrow Notice?

10 messages

Anjali Phukan -MLGCA- <enjeli phuken@meryland.gov>

Tue, Oct 15, 2019 at 3:07 PM

To: Sonia Portitlo -MLGCA- <sonia.portillo@maryland.gov>, James Butler -MLGCA- <jbutler@maryland.gov> Cc: AnjaliReed Phukan <anjalireed@gmail.com>

Good afternoon James and Sonia,

I still don't have an email with the thing I am being required to sign to continue working with MLGCA, stating I can not continue to work at Ocean Downs due to my husband's conflict of interest.

Do I need to see this document before I go to HQ tomorrow? Heave at 3:30 and I need to shut down the laptop soon and pack up before 3:30 (starting shut down at 3:15 for updates). Can I sign or refuse to sign / request modifications tomorrow at headquarters?

Thank you in advance for your assistance in this matter. Should you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Anjali Road Phukan
Gaming Auditor
Maryland Lottery and Gaming
1800 Washington Blvd, Suite 330
Ballimore, MD 21230
Ocean Downs Casino Phone 410-641-0600 x3187
mdlottery.com
anjali.phukan@Maryland.gov
CONNECT WITH US
facebook | twitter | youtube
Maryland Lottery and Gaming contributed \$1.31 billion to the State of Maryland in FY2019.
Please play responsibly.
Click here to complete a two-question customer experience survey.

Sonia Portillo -MLGCA- <sonia.portillo@maryland.gov>

Tue, Oct 15, 2019 at 3:24 PM

To: Anjali Phukan -MLGCA- <anjal..phukan@maryland.gov>

Cc: James Butler -MLGCA- <jbutler@maryland.gov>, Michael Eaton -MLGCA- <michael.eaton@maryland.gov>

Hi Anjali,

Attached please find the agreement to be signed. As per our conversation earlier today, please report to HQ temorrow 10/16. Please note that you wont be reimbursed for mileage as Hollywood will be your new place of work. Also, you will be expected to work your current schedule at Hollywood. Travel time will not be part of your working hours.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks, (Quoted text hidden)

Sonia Portillo
Gaming Division Audit Manager

Maryland Lottery and Gaming Control Agency 1800 Washington Blvd, Suite 330

Baltimore, MD 21230

410-230-8843

Maryland Lottery and Gaming contributed \$1.252 billion to the State of Maryland in FY2018. Please play responsibly.

Phukan Non-Participation Agreement Final 10.15.19.pdf

James Butler -MLGCA- <jbutler@maryland.gov>
To: sonia.portillo@maryland.gov

Tue, Oct 15, 2019 at 3:26 PM

Your message

To: James Butter -MLGCA-Subject: Re: Tomorrow Notice? Sent: 10/15/19, 3:24:51 PM EDT

was road on 10/15/19, 3:26:35 PM EDT

Anjali Phukan -MLGCA- <anjali.phukan@maryland.gov>
Tue, Oct 15, 2019 at 5:27 PM
To: Sonia Portillo -MLGCA- <sonia.portillo@maryland.gov>
Co: James Butler -MLGCA- <jbutler@maryland.gov>, Michael Eaton -MLGCA- <michael.ealon@maryland.gov>, Nathan
Warfield -MLGCA- <nathan.warfield@maryland.gov>

Dear Director Nathan Warfiled, Director Mike Eaton, Manager Sonía Portillo, Supervisor Eric Morgan, and Director James Butler,

I respectfully am submitting my letter of resignation, with my last day official day working Monday 11/04/2019. Please accept this letter as notice of my resignation from my position with MLGCA as gaming auditor, Internal Auditor II.

My husband's conflict of interest requires my departure, as travelling to Hollywood Casino daily with no mileage or travel time reimbursement is unreasonable since I live in Ocean City.

I can sign a conflict statement, soley for the duration of my employment with MLGCA(Until 11/4/19), and that notes my husband's correct title which is manager, not director, as claimed in the emailed attachment I was given at 3pm today.

It has been an honor to work under you all, and I will greatly cherish my time with MLGCA and miss you all greatly.

It has been a pleasure working with you and your team over the last four years, from my first supervisor, Karry to

C-23-CV-21-000083

Page 29 of 53 E-FILED; Worcester Circuit Court Docket: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM; Submission: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM

EXHIBIT F - SEC EMAILED OPINION

2/6/2020

Maryland.gov Mail - Ewid: Ethics Commission - Non-participation guidence in matters involving a exposer or spouse's employer



James Logue -MLGCA- <james.logue@maryland.gov>

Fwd: Ethics Commission - Non-participation guidance in matters involving a spouse or spouse's employer

1 message

James Logue -MLGCA- <james.logue@marylard.gov> To: Michael Eaton -MLGCA- <michael.gaton@maryland.gov> Thu, Oct 10, 2019 at 1:56 PM

From: James Butler -MLGCA- <jbutler@maryland.gov>
Date: Wed, Oct 9, 2019 at 1:23 PM
Subject; Ethics Commission - Non-participation guidance in matters involving a spouse or spouse's employer
To: Gordon Medenica -MLGCA- <gordon.medenica@maryland.gov>, Gina Smith -MLGCA- <gina.smith@maryland.gov>,
James Logue -MLGCA- <james.logue@maryland.gov>, Jim Nielsen -MLGCA- <jim.nielsen@maryland.gov>
Cc: Robert Fontaine -MLGCA- <robert.fontaine@maryland.gov>

All,

I just received this email and attachment from the Jennifer Allgair, General Counset, to the Maryland State Ethics Commission. You will note that the email is addressed to me and our employee, Anjail Phukan, so she is aware of its contents.

In a nutshell, now that Mrs. Phukan, has eloped and married an Ocean Downs employee, she is prohibited from working on any matters in which her spouse or her spouse's employer has an interest.

JB

James B. Butler
Managing Director, Organizational Compliance
jbutler@maryland.gov

Maryland Lottery and Gaming 1800 Washington Blvd, Suile 330 Baltimore, MD 21230 410-230-8781 mdlottery.com

CONNECT WITH THE MARYLAND LOTTERY facebook I twitter I youtube

Maryland Lottery and Gaming contributed \$1,311 billion to the state in FY2019. Please pluy responsibly.

Click here to complete a two-question customer experience survey.

From: Jennifer Allgair -Ethics- <jennifer.ellgair@maryland.gov>
Date: Wod, Oct 9, 2019 at 12:51 PM
Subject: Non-participation guidance in matters involving a spouse or spouse's employer

2/0/2020 Maryland gov Mail - Fwd: Ethics Commission - Non-participation guidance in matters involving a spouse or spouse's employer.

To: James Butler -MLGCA- <jbutler@maryland.gov>, Anjali Phukan -MLGCA- <anjali.phukan@maryland.gov>, Ketherine Thompson (Ethics) <katherine.thompson@maryland.gov>

Mr. Butter and Ms. Phukan,

This email is in response an email I received from Mr. Butter and that Assistant General Counsel Katherine Thompson received from Ms. Phukan regarding the application of the participation restrictions and other conflict of interest provisions of the Public Ethics Law. It is my understanding that Ms. Phukan recently eloped and married an employee of Ocean Downs Casino. Ms. Phukan is an employee of Maryland Lottery and Garning and is currently working as a Gaming Auditor at the Ocean Downs Casino. Due to Ms. Phukan's very recent marriage, it is important that she be removed from all State duties in which Ocean Downs Casino, her spouse's employer has a specific interest. I also recommend drafting into a Non-Participation Agreement for her to document that she will be removed from all matters where her spouse and her spouse's employer has a specific interest. Removing her from duties related only to her spouse's division of the Ocean Downs Casino is insufficient action pursuant to the requirements of Section 5-501 of the Public Ethics Law.

Section 5-501 of the Public Ethics Law prohibits State officials and State employees from participating in matters where a qualifying relative or a qualifying relative's employer has a specific interest in or is a party to the matter. The term 'qualifying relative' is defined in the Public Ethics Law to includes a spouse, parent, child, and sibling.

In Opinion 80-17, the Commission defined "matter" as "any proceeding, application, submission, request for ruling, or other determination, contract, claim, case or other such particular matter..." The Commission defined "participate" as "participating as a State officer or employee in any proceeding, decision, determination, finding, ruling, order, grant, payment, award, license, contract, transaction, sanction or approval, or the donial therefore, or failure to act with respect thereto, personally and substantially through approval, disapproval, decision, recommendation, the rendering of advice, investigation or otherwise." The Commission has determined that "participation" includes attending meetings, holding discussions, reviewing materials and supervision, as well as hands-on activities involved in an individual's State duties. The Commission has addressed issues under 5-501 in Advisory Opinions 07-02, 09-01 and 09-02.

Section 5-501 of the law allows the Commission to grant an exception to allow participation by regulation or advisory opinion. The Commission has granted exceptions in situations where it finds that the overall circumstances and relationships were sufficiently remote to warrant an exception. (See Opinion Nos. 90-2, 90-15, 04-02, 05-01, 05-02, and 07-02). The Commission's participation restriction exceptions have generally been given when the two individuals involved are in separate households and have separate financial holdings. The Commission has not previously granted an exception in a situation involving a shouse or dependent child. The Commission also looks to agency safeguards and restrictions to limit interaction between the qualifying relative's employer and the State employee at issue. When the Commission has allowed participation by advisory opinion or regulatory exception, the Commission has focused on the remoteness of the relationship and has considered such factors as the nature of the qualifying relative's employment, the nature of the relationship between the employee and the qualifying relative, the geographical distance between the relatives, any prior issues related to the participation, agency controls to prevent conflict and the employee's duties related to the matter.

The Commission's exception regulations may be reviewed in COMAR 19A.02.03.01, .02, and .03. The relevant factors the Commission is to consider are found in COMAR 19A.02.03.02 and are:

- The nature of the qualifying relative's relationship with the business entity;
- The nature of the relationship between the official or employee and the qualifying relative;
- C. The geographical distance between the official or employee and the qualifying relative;
- Any prior issues related to the official's or employee's participation in the matter;
- E. Agency controls and safeguards;
- F. Any involvement by the qualifying relative in the matter involving the official or employee; and
- G. The nature of the official's or employee's participation in the matter in relation to the official's or employee's overall duties

Based on the requirements of the Public Ethios Law and the Commission's past advice in similar matters, it is unlikely that Ms. Phukan would be granted any type of participation exception to allow her to have State duties for Maryland Lottery and Gaming related to Ocean Downs Casino, her spouse's employer. She is not prohibited from working for Maryland Lottery and Gaming in matters that involve other casinos or lottery matters so long as neither her spouse nor her spouse's employer has an interest in or is a party to those matters.

2/6/2020	Maryland.gov Mail - Fwd: Ethics Commission - Non-participation guidance in matters involving a spouse or spouse's employer
I recommend that removing Ms. Phyreview and use.	the agency draft a Non-Participation Agreement to address these restrictions and outline a plan of action for Ikan from all matters at the agency involving her spouso and his employer. I have attached a template for you

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this matter. Thank you both for your patience in this matter.

Jonnifor Allgair General Counsel Maryland State Ethics Commission 410-260-7770

Jim Logue Managing Director, Gaming

Maryland Lottery and Gaming 1800 Washington Blvd, Suite 330 Baltimore, MD 21230 410-230-5588 mdlottery.com

CONNECT WITH US facebook I twitter I youtube

Maryland Lottery and Gaming contributed \$1.311 billion to the State of Maryland in FY2019. Please play responsibly.

Click here to complete a three-question customer experience survey.

⊕ draft non participation plan2.docx 23K

Case 1:21-cv-01734-GLR Document 1-2 Filed 07/12/21 PADED; Work Cester Circuit Court C-23-CV-21-000083 Docket: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM; Submission: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM

EXHIBIT G - DEFENDANT EEOC FOLLOW-UP - FIRST FOUR PAGES

Maryland Lottery and Gaming Control Agency

Larry Hogan, Governor . Gordon Medenica, Director

Montgomery Park Business Center 1800 Warrington Bhd., Suite 330 Baltinore, Mandard 21230



Tai: 410-230-8800 TTY usara cai: Manjland Relay www.mdiottery.com

April 29, 2020

Via EEOC Portal only: https://nxg.ecoc.gov/rsp/login/isf No hard copy follows

RE: Confidential Supplemental Position Statement of the Maryland Lottery and Gaming Control Agency EEOC Charge filed by Anjali Chatelle on December 16, 2019 Charge No. 531-2020-00841

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter sets forth the position of Respondent, the Maryland Lottery and Gaming Control Agency ("Agency"), in the referenced charge. The information contained herein and the documents attached hereto are confidential, are submitted only for the purpose of Respondent's position, and should in no way be construed as a waiver of any right or privilege. This letter supplements the Preliminary Response that the Agency submitted on February 13, 2020, which is incorporated by reference.

1. Introduction

The Agency's core mission is to generate revenue to help support the good causes of Maryland including education, public health, public safety, human resources, and the environment. The Agency is committed to maintaining a workplace free of discrimination and takes allegations of discrimination seriously.

Anjali Chatelle's Charge of Discrimination (EEOC Form 5) (hereinalter "Charge") alleges that she has been subject to discrimination based on her "race (East-Indian)" and that she was "constructively discharge[d] on November 4, 2019."

As shown below, the Agency did not discriminate against Ms. Phukan whatsoever and took no action against her based on her race. Moreover, Ms. Phukan was not "discharged" from employment, "constructively" or otherwise. Accordingly, the Agency denies Ms. Phukan's allegation of discrimination and asserts that there is no basis for a determination of probable cause that any discriminatory act has occurred.

II. Facts

The Maryland Lottery and Gaming Control Commission ("Commission") licenses, regulates, and oversees the operations of the State's six video lottery facilities ("casinos"), and staff of the Agency supports the

¹ Ms. Chatelle was known as "Anjali Reed Phukan" at all times relevant to this Charge, and her name is referenced as such in all of the exhibits attached to this Supplemental Position Statement. Therefore, for ease of reference to the exhibits, when discussing the Facts, Respondent shall refer to Complainant as "Ms. Phukan" or "Complainant."

Confidential Supplemental Position Statement of the Maryland Lottery and Gaming Control Agency Charge No. 531-2020-00841 Page 2 of 7

Commission's functions. Md. Code Ann., State Gov't ("SG") § 9-1A-01, et seq. ("the Gaming Law"). Unless an individual holds a valid video lottery employee license issued by the Commission, the individual may not be employed by a casino as a video lottery employee. SG § 9-1A-14(a); Code of Maryland Regulations ("COMAR") 36.03.01.02.B(11), 36.03.02.12.A.

At all times relevant to this Charge, Ms. Phukan worked for the Agency as an Internal Auditor II and was assigned to Ocean Downs Casino. Exhibit 1 (MS-22 Position Description). In this capacity, one of Ms. Phukan's employment duties was to audit the various departments of the casino to which she was assigned. *Id.* Therefore, Ms. Phukan is required by her position to audit Ocean Downs Casino's Surveillance Department. *Id.*

On September 16, 2019, Ms. Phukan notified James Butler, the Agency's Managing Director, Organizational Compliance, that she planned to marry an Ocean Downs casino employee. Exhibit 2 (email entitled "Follow up on Ethics Concern (Self-Reporting)"). Ms. Phukan stated:


I was under the impression I needed to resign before I got the [marriage] license, with a last day of before the actual ceremony, and after talking to you, I believe you wanted to look into possible work around situations for this.

Please let me know if I need to turn in a letter of resignation with 2 weeks notice and take leave or go to [sic] different casino until my last day, or some other middle ground. Our planned wedding date is either Oct 24 so I can work til the end of the pay period ending Oct 22.

I don't have another state job lined up yet, and so I may request unemployment, and so I'd like to leave on good terms under a compelling circumstance if possible.

ld.

On September 23, 2019, Ms. Phukan again contacted Mr. Butler to find out what to do about "my getting married situation to keep my job as it is, since my supervisor, manager, and the director of my department are all apparently ok with just having my supervisor do the surveillance audit when it comes up...." Exhibit 3 (email entitled "Follow up on relationship ethics").



Confidential Supplemental Position Statement of the Maryland Lottery and Gaming Control Agency Charge No. 531-2020-00841 Page 3 of 7

On September 25, 2019, Katherine Thompson, Assistant General Counsel, Maryland State Ethics Commission, replied to a September 23 email from Ms. Phukan and copied Mr. Butler. Exhibit 5 (email entitled "Fwd: Written Ethics Statement Request"). Ms. Phukan's September 23 email stated that she and the easino employee decided to get married, and that she wanted to confirm with Ms. Thompson, before getting the marriage license, that it would not be a conflict of interest. *Id.* Ms. Phukan stated that "[Ethics] counsel on duty said was OK as far as the state board was concerned, with our getting married, but to check with my agency." *Id.* She indicated that her supervisor, manager, and department director seemed amenable to a planned work-around solution to avoid a possible conflict of interest, but that the Agency's Organizational Compliance Director (Mr. Butler) wanted her to get something in writing from the Ethics Commission. *Id.*

On October 7, 2019, Ms. Phukan notified Mr. Butler and Michael Eaton, the Agency's Director of Audit and Regulatory Compliance, that she "eloped with a [sic] Ocean Downs Casino surveillance department employee yesterday." Exhibit 6 (email entitled "Ethics Notice"). Ms. Phukan asked if the Agency needed additional information from her, and noted that she did not yet have anything in writing from the State Ethics Commission. Id.

On October 9, 2019, Ms. Allgair notified Ms. Phukan and Mr. Butler of the State Ethics Commission's position regarding Ms. Phukan's marriage. Exhibit 7 (email entitled "Fwd: Non-participation guidance in matters involving a spouse or spouse's employer"). Ms. Allgair stated:

Due to [her] very recent marriage, it is important that she be removed from all State duties in which Ocean Downs Casino, her spouse's employer[,] has a specific interest. I also recommend drafting into a [sic] Non-Participation Agreement for her to document that she will be removed from all matters where her spouse and her spouse's employer has a specific interest. Removing her from duties related only to her spouse's division of the Ocean Downs Casino is insufficient action pursuant to the requirements of Section 5-501 of the Public Ethics Law.

Section 5-501 of the Public Ethics Law prohibits State officials and State employees from participating in matters where a qualifying relative or a qualifying relative's employer has a specific interest in or is a party to the matter. The term "qualifying relative" is defined in the Public Ethics Law to includes [sic] spouse, parent, child, and sibling. . . .

regulation or advisory opinion. The Commission has granted exceptions in situations where it finds that the overall circumstances and relationships were sufficiently remote to warrant an exception...The Commission's participation restriction exceptions have generally been given when the two individuals involved are in separate households and have separate financial holdings. The Commission has not previously granted an exception in a situation involving a spouse or dependent child.

Id. (emphasis in original). Ms. Allgair made clear that Ms. Phukan is not prohibited from working for the Agency in matters that involve other easinos or the Agency's lottery division, so long as neither her spouse nor her spouse's employer has an interest in or is a party to those matters. Id. She recommended that the

Confidential Supplemental Position Statement of the Maryland Lottery and Gaming Control Agency Charge No. 531-2020-00841 Page 4 of 7

Agency draft a Non-Participation Agreement to address these restrictions, and she attached a sample Agreement. Id.


On October 9, 2019, Ms. Phukan replied to Ms. Alligair, stating that she "was made aware today that another MLGCA employee stationed at this Ocean Downs casino is married to an Ocean Downs casino employee as well," and that making her resign would be unfair. *Id.* She also stated that Nathan Warfield, the Agency's Director of Human Resources, was made aware of the other employee's marriage. *Id.*

On October 11, 2019, Ms. Phukan emailed her supervisors, acknowledging that she will need to transfer from Ocean Downs, and that her preference was Horseshoe Casino in Baltimore, followed by Hollywood Casino in Perryville. Exhibit 8 (email entitled "Transferring and Logistics").

On October 15, 2019, Ms. Phukan contacted Mr. Butler, and Sonia Portillo, the Agency's Gaming Division Audit Manager, seeking the document she needed to sign due to her "husband's conflict of interest," and asking whether she could modify or sign it the next day when she would be at Agency headquarters. Exhibit 9 (email thread entitled "Tomorrow Notice?"). Ms. Portillo sent her the draft Non-Participation Agreement and reminded her that she would not be reimbursed for mileage to Hollywood because that would be her new workplace, and that travel time would not be part of her work hours. Id.

Later on October 15, Ms. Plukan instead submitted her resignation to Ms. Portillo, copying Mr. Butler and Mr. Warfield, and identified her last work day as November 4. *Id.* As reasons for resigning, Ms. Plukan said: "My husband's conflict of interest requires my departure, as travelling to Hollywood Casino daily with no mileage or travel time reimbursement is unreasonable since I live in Ocean City." *Id.* She stated that she would sign a "conflict statement" to cover the time until November 4. *Id.* She said she cherished her time working in this position, and offered to help recruit and train her replacement. *Id.*

Rather than require Ms. Phukan to report to Hollywood for the remaining two weeks left of her Agency employment or allow her to continue to work at Ocean Downs in spite of the Ethics Commission's position, the Agency accepted her resignation and placed her on paid administrative leave until November 4. Exhibit 10 (October 16, 2019 Warfield Letter). On October 16, Ms. Phukan made slight edits to the draft Non-Participation Agreement, and signed it on October 17. Exhibit 11 (email entitled "Signed non participation agreement with strikes/edits"), and Exhibit 12 (Signed Non-Participation Agreement).



Case 1:21-cv-01734-GLR Document 1-2 Filed 07/12/21 Page 39 of 53 E-FILED; Worcester Circuit Court Docket: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM; Submission: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM

EXHIBIT J - DEFENDANT'S INITIAL RESPONSE TO EEOC CHARGE INCLUDING STATEMENT REGARDING ADAM

Maryland Lottery and Gaming Control Agency

Larry Hogan, Governor . Gordon Medenica, Director

Moragomery Park Business Center 1800 Washington Blvd., Suite 330 Baltimore, Maryland 21230



Tel: 410-230-8800 TTY users call Maryland Reby www.molettery.com

February 13, 2020

Sent via EEOC Respondent's Portal only/no hard copy follows Baltimore Community Relations Commission 7 E. Redwood St. 9th Floor Baltimore, Maryland 21202

RE: Preliminary Response of the Maryland Lottery and Gaming Control Agency to EEOC complaint filed by Anjali Chatelle on December 15, 2019 Charge No. 531-2020-00841

To Whom It May Concern:

The Maryland Lottery and Gaming Control Agency ("MLGCA") absolutely, completely, and vehemently denies that there has been any discrimination whatsoever against Anjali Chatelle (formerly Phukan).

Regarding Anjali Chantelle.

The MLGCA licenses, regulates, and oversees the operations of the State's six casinos, and it issues licenses to all casino employees. An individual cannot work as a casino employee without holding a MLGCA-issued gaming or non-gaming license.

The MLGCA made decisions about Ms. Chantelle and her employment assignment based on the advice of the State Ethics Commission. Ms. Chatelle was employed by MLGCA as a Gaming Auditor at Ocean Downs Casino. One of her duties as an auditor for MLGCA was to monitor the surveillance department operated by the easino. On October 7, 2019, she advised MLGCA that, the previous day, she had eloped with the individual employed by Ocean Downs Casino who is manager of its surveillance department. This individual holds a gaming license issued by the MLGCA. On October 9, 2019, the State Ethics Commission advised MLGCA that the State's Public Ethics Law prohibits State employees from participating in matters where a qualifying relative or a qualifying relative's employer has a specific interest in or is a party to the matter (October 10, 2019 email thread, attached). In short, the State Ethics Commission advised MLGCA that Ms. Chatelle's assignment to the Ocean Downs Casino, where her spouse was employed, would constitute an impermissible conflict of interest.

At the suggestion of the Ethics Commission, MLGCA removed Ms. Chantelle from all matters concerning Ocean Downs Casino, and reassigned her to work at Hollywood Casino, where a Gaming Auditor vacancy existed. Rather than accept the reassignment, on October 15, 2019, Ms. Chantelle notified MLGCA that she was resigning her employment.

Regarding Adam Milehak.

Likewise, MLGCA will make decisions about Adam Milchak and his employment assignment based on the advice of the State Ethics Commission. Mr. Milchak is employed by MLGCA as a Casino Compliance Representative at Ocean Downs Casino. His wife works at Ocean Downs Casino as a bartender, and holds a non-gaming license issued by MLGCA. On October 23, 2019, the MLGCA asked the State Ethics Commission to review the Milchaks' situation. It was the Agency's belief that ethics considerations for the Milchaks were vastly different than for Ms. Chantelle and her husband, because the Milchaks' job functions did not intersect whatsoever.

On February 10, 2020, the MLGCA received the State Ethics Commission's advice that Adam Milchak's participation in MLGCA matters involving his spouse's employer, Ocean Downs Casino, constituted an impermissible conflict of interest (February 10, 2020, Confidential State Ethics Commission advice, attached). The State Ethics Commission has requested that MLGCA provide it with a plan and timeline for compliance with the advice. MLGCA has notified Mr. Milchak of the State Ethics Commission advice and request, and is now working on a compliance plan. Such a plan most likely will involve either reassigning Mr. Milchak to another casino, or he wife resigning from her position at Ocean Downs.

For the reasons set forth in MLGCA's request for extension of time within which to submit a response, there is not sufficient time for counsel to prepare and submit a complete Agency position statement. The MLGCA shall submit a supplemental, complete position statement directly.

Sincerely,

Director of Human Resources

Nathan A. Warfield

Attachment 1: October 10, 2019 email thread

Attachment 2: February 10, 2020, Confidential State Ethics Commission advice (Confidential

pursuant to Maryland Code Ann., Gen Prov. § 5-301(b)(2))

ce: James Butler, EEOC Representative and Managing Director, Organizational Compliance John Mooney, Managing Director, Regulatory Oversight

Case 1:21-cv-01734-GLR Document 1-2 Filed 07/12/21 Page 42 of 53 E-FILED; Worcester Circuit Court

C-23-CV-21-000083

Docket: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM; Submission: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM

EXHIBIT I - RECEIPT FOR STATE PROPERTY AND DEMANDED NON-PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT STAPLED TO THE RECEIPT FOR STATE PROPERTY

Maryland Lottery and Gaming Control Agency Lerry Hogan, Covernor • Geriden Medenica, Director

MARYLAND

Montgomery Park Business Center 1500 Washington Bird., Suffs 330 Baltimore, Manyland 21230

cc: Employee

In: 410-230-eeco TIY over cell Mayland Reby Www.mileney.com

	Receipt for State Property
Employee's Name:	Anjali Phykan
Agency; <u>h</u>	laryland Lottery and Gaming Control Agency
If you have any State manager/supervisor pr equipment and record t	property or equipment, you must return those items to your direction to leaving this Agency. Your manager will inspect the returned the pertinent data for each item below. Please keep a copy of the signed Managers will forward the completed form to Human Resources.
Laptop(s)	45
Cell-Phone(s)	
State-Vehicly	
Key(s)	¥}
Access Card / Key Fob	<u>4</u>
State ID (if leaving State service	
Other	oden Down office Key
I certify that the above Item	is were received on: 10/13-12019
Received by: <u>Sowt</u>	< Parliko (Date)
Contact Phone Number:	F1[000f.]05
COMMENTS (note any damaged	equipment): PA

MARYLAND LOTTERY & GAMING NON-PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT

I, Anjali Reed Phukan, work for the State of Maryland at the Maryland Lottery and Gaming Control Agency ("MLGCA"), and I am currently assigned to the Ocean Downs Casino as a Gaming Auditor. On October 6, 2019, I eloped and am now married to Mark Chatelle, who is the Manager of Surveillance at Ocean Downs Casino, which is owned and operated by Old Bay Gaming & Racing, LLC and which is a subsidiary of Churchill Downs, Inc., both of whom are regulated and licensed by the Maryland Lottery and Gaming Control Commission ("MLGCC").

I understand that due to my spouse's employment with Ocean Downs and his possession of a gaming license issued by MLGCC, there is a possibility that a conflict of interest could arise if I were required to participate in an audit or investigate an incident in which my spouse or his department were involved. Additionally, there may otherwise be a perceived conflict of interest if affirmative steps are not taken to prevent my involvement or participation in any matter, meeting, discussion, review, audit or investigation in which my spouse, his department or his employer may be involved.

PURPOSE OF AGREEMENT

Therefore, this non-participation agreement is providing workplace requirements to comply with the conflict of interest provisions of the Maryland Public Ethics Law ("Ethics Law") in light of my State employment with MLGCA and my spouse's employment with Ocean Downs Casino, which holds a Video Lottery Operation License issued by MLGCC, an entity to which I am assigned to review, monitor, and audit on a regular basis.

SUMMARY

As State employees, we are bound to conduct ourselves in a manner that is free of the existence or perception of any conflict of interest. The Ethics Law sets standards of ethical conduct, and it is crucial that every employee adhere to these standards. The Ethics Law is there to help us make decisions that are in the best interest of the State and free of influence from parties that may benefit from our decisions and work. We are required to conduct ourselves so that we do not even appear to be improperly influenced.

ANALYSIS

Section 5-501 of the Ethics Law prohibits a State employee from participating in matters in which an outside employer has a specific interest. I am a State of Maryland employee, and my spouse is a licensed gaming employee of Ocean Downs Casino. My specific job functions may require me to audit the department that my husband directly manages. As such, I can no longer perform my auditing duties and responsibilities at Ocean Downs because my spouse has an interest in the same casino that I am assigned to audit. Therefore, I must be removed from all State duties and responsibilities in which Ocean Downs Casino, my spouse's employer, has a specific interest. In

afficipation Agreement all Reed Phikan

order to ensure MLGCA and MLGCC comply with the Ethics Law, we are memorializing this non-participation agreement to avoid a conflict or appearance of a conflict of interest.

WORK PLAN

I understand and acknowledge that:

- As a MLGCA Auditor, I am prohibited from performing the following auditing duties and responsibilities concerning all gaming operations, including the Surveillance Department, at Ocean Downs Casino, which include:
 - A. Analyze, document, and perform testing of minimum internal controls and business processes at facilities;
 - B. Review and evaluate the adequacy and effectiveness of internal controls;
 - C. Review and evaluate compliance with internal control policies and procedures approved by the Maryland Lottery Commission:
 - Conduct interviews with casino personnel to ensure that the casino is complying with documented internal accounting controls;
 - Assist the Audit Supervisor in making decisions and recommendations related to audit procedures performed at gaming facility; and
 - F. Assist the Audit Supervisor in making recommendations to the facility operator related to observations noted during audits and other observations.
- 1 am prohibited from participating in all auditing duties and responsibilities outlined above at Ocean Downs Casino.
- 3. The participation restrictions under §5-501 of the Public Ethics Law are broad and prohibit my participation in discussions, meetings, supervision, as well as decision making in any matters in which Ocean Downs Casino has a specific interest.
- 4. Any and all matters, to include interactions and participation, with Ocean Downs employees now will be handled by my supervisor, Eric Morgan, Gaming Audit Supervisor, located at MLGCA's Headquarters in Bultimore, MD.
- 5. This agreement will be circulated to my supervisors so when incidents or matters arise at Ocean Downs involving my spouse, Mark Chatelle, or his employer, Ocean Downs Casino, I must immediately recuse myself and completely remove myself from the situation.
- I shall not have any involvement in any aspect of any review, report, or investigation that
 may involve my spouse, Mark Chatelle, or his employer, Ocean Downs Casino.

Non-Participation Agreement Anjali Reed Phukan

- 7. In the event an incident arises that may involve my spouse, Mark Chatelle, or his employer. Ocean Downs Casino, I shall immediately contact my immediate supervisor so that he/she intervenes accordingly.
- 8. I understand that effective, October 16, 2019, I am being reassigned to Hollywood Casino Perryville, Perryville, MD, as the Gaming Auditor, until November 4, 2019

As a State employee, I am also aware of additional restrictions under the Public Ethics Law. Section 5-506 of the Public Ethics Law prohibits a State employee or official from intentionally using the prestige of public position for private gain or for the private gain of another. Additionally, Section 5-507 of the Public Ethics Law prohibits a State employee or official from disclosing or using confidential information acquired by reason of the employee or official's public position, which is not available to the public, for personal economic benefit or the economic benefit of another.

Signature: Apjali Reed Phillian

Signature: Print Witness' Name

101171

Date Signed

-2 Filed 07/12/21 Page 47 of 53 E-FILED; Worcester Circuit Court Docket: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM; Submission: 5/25/2021 9:44 PM

C-23-CV-21-000083

EXHIBIT A - POSITION DESCRIPTION

STATE OF MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT OFFICE OF PERSONNEL SERVICES AND BENEFITS 301 West Preston Street 301 West Preston Street Baltimore, Maryland 21201

file

PART I. IDENTIFYING POSITION INFORM	IATION		
ITEMS 1-6 to be completed by Agency Personne	Office		
1. PIN: 088603	2. CLASS CODE/GRADE 4373/16		
3. SERVICE	4. IS THIS POSITION DESIGNATED AS A SPECIAL APPOINTMENT? NO		
SS 5. OVERTIME STATUS N	6. AGENCY APPROPRIATION COD 240400		
ITEMS 7-13 to be completed by the supervisor. 7. Current Employee's Name, if applicable	Anjali Phukan		
8. Class Title $\bar{1}$	Internal Auditor II		
Working Title, if different	fferent Gaming Auditor		
9. Department or Agency Name	Maryland State Lottery Agency		
Division, Unit or Section	AFO/VLT		
10. Work Location/Address 102	10218 Racetrack Road, Berlin, MD 21811		
11. Name of Immediate Supervisor	Karry Pifer		
Title of Immediate Supervisor	Internal Audit Supervisor		
12. Work Schedule: (Check all that apply)			
Permanent Day Shift	☐ Rotating Shift		
Permanent Evening Shift	⊠ Full Time		
Permanent Night Shift	☐ Part Time		
Other (Explain)			


PART II. POSITION FUNCTIONS

ITEMS 1-7 If additional space is required, attach a separate sheet.

MAIN PURPOSE OF THE JOB: Briefly describe the main purpose of this position and how
it related to the mission of the agency.
Conduct compliance, economy and efficiency, and program results of the Lottery and to
review, evaluate and test internal controls in place at the video lottery easinos.

ESSENTIAL JOB FUNCTIONS AND OTHER ASSIGNED DUTIES - List duty and responsibility statements that identify the essential job functions and other assigned duties. Essential job functions are the fundamental job duties of a position that if not performed will alter the job. (Identify essential job functions by highlighting, underlining, etc.)

% of Time and/or Weight of	
Importance	Job Duly
70	Work under supervision of Audit Supervisor in conducting scheduled audits of Casinos, Bingo Halls, and VFWs (planning, fieldwork, reporting, follow-up). Assist Audit Supervisor with development of audit documentation (i.e., audit scope and objectives, audit programs, checklists, and testing work papers). This position will answer audit objectives, obtain sufficient and appropriate evidence, support conclusions and form appropriate recommendations that are auditable and feasible. Audits performed in all areas of easino operations (slots, table games, accounting, cage, responsible gambling, marketing, surveillance, security, revenue audits, IT, etc.). Limited scope audits performed at Bingo Hall and VFW facilities.
5	Assist Audit Supervisor with preparation and review of audit reports.
10	Travel to Casino, Bingo Hall, and VFW facilities to conduct audits.
	Analyze, document, and perform testing of business processes at facilities.
	Review and evaluate the adequacy and effectiveness of internal controls.
	 Review and evaluate compliance with internal control policies and procedures approved by the Maryland Lottery Commission.
	Conduct interviews with casino personnel to ensure that the casino is complying with documented internal accounting controls.
5	Assist in daily administration of the Audit Department:
	Provide status reports to Audit Supervisor on a weekly basis



Work involves special physical demands such as lifting 50 pounds or more, climbing

ladders, etc. (Explain)

3. Displays a professional demeanor.

Quality of Work

- 1. Understands clearly the licensee's internal controls/accounting procedures.
- 2. Follows Audit Division's workpaper guidelines and presentation techniques.
- 3. Prepares workpapers that are logical and support the audit program.
- 4. Derives findings from test work.
- 5. Presents practical and effective recommendations to address the findings.
- 6. Minimizes review time by supervisor and director.

Timeliness of Work

- 1. Plans, organizes and completes pre-fieldwork according to instructions.
- 2. Provides timely status reports and keeps supervisor and director informed of possible delays.
- 3. Meets overall project deadline.

Decision Making and Judgment

- 1. Recognizes and promptly advises superiors of problems or issues,
- 2. Demonstrates knowledge and use of current information technology equipment, programs, and services in order to effectively and efficiently perform the engagement/project.
- 3. Draws sound conclusions from test work.
- 4. Ensures that the test procedure is relevant to the audit objectives.
- 5. Prepares alternate procedures when needed.

Writing Skills

- 1. Prepares reports, memos, procedures and flowcharts in accordance with current formats.
- 2. Prepares written documents in concise, complete, clear, organized language free of punctuation, grammar and spelling errors.
- Demonstrates a desire to improve by using available resources such as spelling and grammar checking tools and attending relevant training sessions.

Oral Communications

- 1. Communicates in an efficient, effective and polite manner with the client and fellow auditors.
- 2. Communicates complex processes in clear terms that the listener can understand.
- 3. Keeps the conversation concise and relevant.

Flexibility

- 1. Has a positive, can-do approach to the work, and is supportive of the Auditor's Office.
- 2. Works together with others as a team player.
- 3. Accepts changes in assignments willingly,

Initiative and Need for Supervision

- 1. Takes responsibility for work performed.
- 2. Finds innovative ways to help and improve the office being reviewed. Reports valid areas of risk to the manager, explaining why it's a risk and what audit procedures and techniques should be incorporated into the audit program.
- 3. Completes audits with little supervision.

PART V SIGNATURES

The following signatures indicate acknowledgment by the employee of the information on this form, when applicable, and approval by the supervisor and appointing authority.

PART III	RESPONSIBILITIES FOR THE WORK OF OTHERS
includes ful	n should be completed if this position is responsible for the work of others. This I and part-time permanent employees, contractual or emergency employees, reimbursable or loaned employees. If additional space is required, attach a separat
A supervisor promotion a performance spokespersor	AND LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR WORK OF OTHERS: of assigns and reviews the work of other, trains employees, recommends the selection of temployees, approves leave and signs time cards, signs annual e evaluations, determines and resolves procedural problems within the unit, serves on for subordinates, explains policies and directives from management and issues inhimary reminders, warnings and reprimands.
	<u>ker</u> assigns and reviews the work of others, instructs and motivates worker, is rimmediate assistance or review and performs the work of the classification.
a) Does th	is position supervise employees? 🔲 Yes 🔲 No
b) Does th	is position lead employees? ☐ Yes ☑No
	o a or b, list the names and classifications of the employees that this position ies or leads.
☐ Assi ☐ Appi ☐ Sign ☐ Inter ☐ Trai ☐ Disc	he ways that this position supervises or leads these employees. (check all that apports and reviews work ove leave, sign time eard amoual performance ratings view & select new employees not employees not employees counsel, recommend suspension & termination) Do any of the test supervised have supervisory responsibility? If so, list them and the names and ations of those they supervise or attach an approved organization chart.
PART IV	PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
1. Limits the 2. Limits the 3. Prepares 4. Produces 5. Understa	of Job Knowledge: c number of review comments by the manager and director. c need for supervision by the audit supervisor and/or director, audit documentation as needed with little supervision and correction, effective ICQs, flowcharts, audit programs, procedural documentation, etc. ands statues and policies pertaining to the area being examined, uditing theory to engagement/project.

	<i>/</i>	
	Clui 1/h_	5/25/2016
1	Employee's Signature Aud Sor Ma	Date 5/16
1	Supervisor's Signature	Daté
	Appointing Authority or Designee	Date

Form MS-22 Revised 10/96